DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 306 510 CG 021 643

AUTHOR Craig, Delores E.
TITLE The School as a Value Influencing Institution.
PUB DATE 28 Mar 89
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Junior High Schools; *Junior High School Students; Principals; *School Attitudes; *School Role; Sex Differences; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes; *Values

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between student values and the values of the school as an institution, with emphasis on how this relationship is mediated by the student's sentiment toward the school. Subjects were 353 seventh- and eighth-grade students, 11 of their social studies teachers, and building principals from three schools in the Honolulu (Hawaii) School District. The Cole (1972) adolescent version of the Rokeach Value Survey, Form D, was administered to students, teachers, and principals. The Quality of School Life Scale (QSL) was administered to students. The results revealed that school values and student values were not independent of each other. Students who obtained high scores on the QSL conformed to each other with respect to ranking of values, as did students with low scores. High scorers placed high priorities on family love, religious faith, and achievement. Low scorers placed high priorities on pleasure, prosperous life, exciting life, being brave, and being creative. Values appeared to be much influenced by gender. Female students more highly ranked such values as friendship, honesty, helpfulness, being loving, and forgiving. Male students gave higher rankings to such values as an exciting life, intelligence, bravery, and creativity. The value preferences of these subjects were very much alike. Despite wide differences in socioeconomic status, value preferences were related, suggesting that the period of early adolescence itself is a strong factor in reported values. (NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED306510

THE SCHOOL AS A VALUE INFLUENCING INSTITUTION

DELORES E. CRAIG

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE-CHATTANOOGA

CG 021643

A Symposium Paper Presented at
the annual meeting of

The American Educational Research Association
San Francisco, California

March 28, 1989

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Delores E Craig

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INTRODUCTION

This study broadened the overall line of inquiry on values of individuals. It accomplished this by examining the values of early adolescents and the possible influence of school, looking at the relationships between institutional values and individual values. The research questions centered around the relationship between student values and the values of the school as an institution, with emphasis on how this relationship is mediated by the student's sentiment toward the school.

This investigation addressed the following research questions:

1. What is the relationship between the values profile of a school and the values profiles of students?
2. To what extent does the relationship between the values profile of the school and the values profile of the student vary with the student response to the Quality of School Life Scale, a measure of student sentiment?

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

Subjects of this study were 353 students in the 7th and 8th grades, 11 of their social studies teachers, and 3 building principals; all in three of the Honolulu School District intermediate schools. The schools were selected so as to obtain a school at each socioeconomic level. At least two classrooms of students at each grade level in each school were randomly selected in each school from all of the social studies classrooms at each grade level. All students provided information concerning the name of the school, grade level, gender, and their age at the time of survey (range was 12-15 years).

Setting

Each of the three schools represented a different socioeconomic status level. School Alpha (lower SES) had 48% of its students on a free or partially paid lunch program, with a current enrollment of 1,250 students. School Beta (upper SES) had 10% of its students on free or partially paid lunch program, with 450 students currently enrolled. School Gamma (middle SES) had 31% of its students on a free or partially paid lunch program, with 850 students at the time of the study.

All of the schools were located within their catchment areas and did not participate in any busing program for student exchange. While all three schools were located in Honolulu, each was a part of a distinctly different community. School Alpha was located in an international district with many Filipino students. School Beta was in a very affluent neighborhood of exclusive homes near Diamond Head. The ethnic composition of the student body featured a Japanese majority, with substantial

numbers of different ethnic groups. School Gamma was located in a very mobile area of apartment and condominium dwellers. All three schools used the same district scope and sequence documents and claimed to follow the same basic program of social studies.

School Values Model

The model of the school's values results from giving equal weight to each of five different value rankings. The five different sources were averaged to create one value ranking of the Cole (1972) list of values for each school. The components in the school value model included the ranking generated by the socioeconomic status of the students in the school, the ranking generated by the geographic location of the school, the ranking based on the social studies program and text, the ranking of the values of the principal, and the ranking of the values of the teachers of social studies. A brief description of the procedure for developing each ranking is outlined separately.

Identification of the socioeconomic status of the school was determined on the basis of the numbers of students on free lunch or partial paid lunch programs. A separate ranking of the values on the Cole (1972) version of the Rokeach Value Survey Form D was made for each school. The ranking was based on information from Carnoy and Levin (1985) and the Anyon (1981) study which linked school learning process with socioeconomic status of the community.

All three of the schools studied were located in an urban area, so each carried the same relative ranking of values for location. Derivation of the ranking for location was from a logical analysis of the impact of school location. This analysis considered the expected influence of being part of a complex community with many students per social niche. The students in such urban schools had more opportunities to observe than to participate, according to the findings of Barker and Gump (1964). It was also expected there would be a greater emphasis put on such adaptive skills as cooperation and being helpful--skills of greater benefit in the dense populations of these urban schools.

The social studies program of each school provided the cognitively oriented set of values averaged in the school values model. The Cole values ranking was obtained by a content analysis of the social studies curriculum, and the average value rankings of the social studies texts as perceived by the social studies teachers. The content analysis of the social studies curriculum was accomplished in the same manner used by Ryan (1973) in a study of student values conflicts in Hawaii. The social studies teachers in each of the three schools provided rankings of the Cole values in the social studies texts, which were averaged. The social studies curriculum analysis ranking, the teacher perceived social studies texts ranking and the combined ranking are available in Appendix A, Table I and Table II.

The fourth element in the model was the value ranking of the principal as the symbol of authority. Each school principal was asked to complete a value survey to indicate the values of the school. Each principal commented about the important factors

which he/she thought influenced student values formation.

The final element of the model was the personal values selection of the social studies teachers. These teachers were selected because of the content of the courses that they teach. The values of the teachers at each school were averaged. There were five social studies teachers at School Alpha, three social studies teachers at School Beta, and three social studies teachers at School Gamma.

The information obtained from each of the five sources of value rankings was then averaged, giving equal weight to each of the elements. The result of the averaging process was a list of mean rankings of each of the 14 terminal values and the 15 instrumental values on the Cole instrument. A list was generated for each of the three schools and became the school value profile. The values profiles for each school are available in Appendix A, Table I.

Instruments

The Cole (1972) adolescent version of the Rokeach Value Survey, Form D, was administered to students, social studies teachers and the principals by the researcher. The Cole version has a test-retest reliability of .77 for the Terminal Values and of 14 cards with one terminal value per card, and a set of 15 cards with one instrumental value per card. The subject arranges each set of cards from most preferred to least preferred, and then enters a letter of the alphabet associated with the value name on the appropriate line of a sheet. The result is a terminal value ranking set and an instrumental value ranking set. A list of the terminal values and the instrumental values is available in Appendix B, Table III. These values were used in the school values model.

The Quality of School Life Scale (QSL), developed by Epstein and McPartland (1976), was also administered to groups of students by the researcher. Reported reliability of this instrument ranges from .80 to .89 for elementary and secondary students, with an unspecified interval of time for the retesting. The QSL consists of 27 questions that form the basis for three subscales: (1) satisfaction with school in general (SAT), (2) commitment to school work (COM), and (3) reactions to teachers (TCH).

RESULTS

The results of the statistical analyses, presented in the order of the hypothesis being tested are outlined here.

Hypothesis 1: There is no relationship between the values profile of the school and the values profile of the students.

A Spearman rank correlation coefficient was computed to test the relationship between the mean rankings of values obtained from the model of school values and the mean rankings of values obtained from the students of the school. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient obtained for each school is presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

SPEARMAN RANK COEFFICIENTS OF SCHOOL VALUES AND STUDENT VALUES

School	Rho	Probability
Alpha	.7153	0.001
Beta	.3923	0.018
Gamma	.7209	0.001

The Spearman rank correlation coefficients indicate that the probability of the null hypothesis is sufficiently low to allow for its rejection using a 0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant level of conformity of student value profiles among students with high scores on the Quality of School Life Scale and no significant level of conformity of student value profiles among students with low scores on the Quality of School Life Scale.

The QSL total scores of students were ranked and classified according to whether they were within the upper, middle or lower one-third of the students, with respect to the QSL. The level of concordance was measured for high and low score groups within each school, using the Kendall coefficient of conformity. Separate calculations were done for the terminal values rankings and the instrumental values rankings. Results are presented in Table 2.

The Kendall coefficients of concordance presented in Table 2 indicate there are significant levels of concordance in all of the groups characterized by students with high QSL scores. All of these coefficients indicate that the probability of the null hypothesis is 0.05 or less. The levels of coefficients in the groups with high QSL scores are higher than in the groups with lower QSL scores.

TABLE 2

COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE ON STUDENT VALUES
BY SCHOOL AND QSL SCORE LEVEL

School	Terminal Values Hi QSL	Low QSL
Alpha	.2341* (N = 32)	.2385* (N = 35)
Beta	.3906* (N = 10)	.1538** (N = 13)
Gamma	.2303* (N = 48)	.2185* (N = 45)

School	Instrumental Values Hi QSL	Low QSL
Alpha	.3024* (N = 32)	.1208* (N = 35)
Beta	.1719** (N = 10)	.1269 (N = 13)
Gamma	.2185* (N = 48)	.0913* (N = 45)

*Significant at 0.01 level
**Significant at the 0.05 level

Hypothesis 3: Student value profiles are independent of the school attended, grade level, gender, and QSL score levels.

This hypothesis was tested by a four-way factorial analysis of variance of each value. Table 3 includes a display of the effects which are associated with a probability less than 0.05.

Interactions with an alpha level of less than 0.05 were of five types: school by grade; school by gender; grade by gender; QSL score level by gender; QSL score level by school. The values secure country, religious faith, prosperous life, and being honest showed the school by grade interaction. The value of being ambitious showed the school by gender interaction of effects. The interaction of grade and gender occurred for values of true friendship, being loving, and being capable. QSL score levels and gender interactions affected the values of true friendship, self-controlled, brave, creative, and influential. The interaction of school and QSL score levels was observed for values of respect of others and being influential. Mean rankings of values for all interaction effects are available in Appendix D.

TABLE 3

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
ON STUDENT VALUE RANKINGS

Category	Main Effects					Interactions					
	School	Gender	Grade	QSL	Sch Gr	Sch Gen	GR GE	QSL Sch	QSL GE	QSL GR	3-Way
Terminal Values											
Family Love			●	◦							
Peaceful World											
Freedom of Choice	◦										
Equal Opportunity											
Beautiful World											
True Friendship		◦					●		◦		
Respect for Others	●							●			
Secure Country					●						
Pleasure				◦							●
Confidence	◦										
Religious Faith				●	●						●
Achievement				◦							
Prosperous Life				●	●						
Exciting Life		◦	◦	◦							
Instrumental Values											
Honest		◦			●						
Helpful		●									
Clean			◦								
Loving		●					●				
Forgiving		◦		◦							
Ambitious						●					
Cheerful											
Polite		◦									
Dependable	●										
Capable							●				
Intelligent		◦									
Self-Controlled			●						●		
Brave		◦		◦					●		
Creative		◦		●					●		
Influential		◦						●	●		●

◦ Effect is significant at 0.01 level.

● Effect is significant at 0.05 level.

The mean rankings of values by the entire sample of students in this study is presented in Table 4. These average student rankings can be compared with the mean rankings provided in Appendix C. Appendix C shows the effects of school, gender, grade, and QSL score level on the mean rankings of the various values.

The results can be summarized in terms of the hypotheses tested. Hypothesis 1, stating that there is no relationship between school values and student values, was rejected on the basis of the three Spearman rank correlation coefficients. Hypothesis 2, stating that there is no significant level of concordance for the student values of those with high QSL scores and for those with low QSL scores, was rejected on the basis of the Kendall coefficients of concordance. Hypothesis 3, concerning the uniform variability of values across schools, gender, grade, and QSL score level and was rejected because the analysis showed differences in mean rankings due to effects of school, gender, grade, and QSL score level.

TABLE 4

MEAN REPORTED RANKINGS OF STUDENT VALUES

Category	Mean Ranking
Terminal Values	
Family Love	3.17
Peaceful World	5.87
Freedom of Choice	6.59
Equal Opportunity	8.55
Beautiful World	8.28
True Friendship	5.50
Respect for Others	7.62
Secure Country	7.84
Pleasure	7.56
Confidence	6.58
Religious Faith	10.52
Achievement	9.22
Prosperous Life	8.25
Exciting Life	9.41
Instrumental Values	
Honest	5.20
Helpful	6.73
Clean	9.81
Loving	5.11
Forgiving	7.39
Ambitious	8.08
Cheerful	9.27
Polite	6.86
Dependable	7.53
Capable	8.62
Intelligent	7.04
Self-Controlled	6.66
Brave	10.14
Creative	10.42
Influential	11.16

DISCUSSION

Three areas of discussion emerge from the research questions and results obtained. The school values model has been tested and can be discussed in terms of how it functioned, and future research potential. The second area focuses on the results regarding the Quality of School Life Scale and how it informs the work on values. These first two topics form a basis for discussion about the significance of findings on values in general. The limitations of this study and research implications form the final section.

The School Values Model

School values, as described by the model, and student values are not independent. The Spearman rho shows that the two vary together. The coefficient for School Alpha was 0.7153, School Beta was 0.3923, and School Gamma was 0.7209. To understand the variability in the Spearman rho coefficients, two processes were used. The Spearman rho was calculated to test for the overall agreement among students in all three schools, and a Spearman rho was calculated to test the level of agreement between each element in the school values model and student values.

The Spearman rho calculation to test for the overall agreement among students indicated substantial agreement. The Spearman rho coefficients were 0.9447 for students of Schools Alpha and Beta, 0.9369 for students of Schools Alpha and Gamma, and 0.9210 for students of Schools Beta and Gamma. These coefficients indicate that students in this study are homogeneous in their rankings of values. This does not preclude the possibility of school influence but it does indicate that early adolescents as a group have a great deal in common with respect to values. The information from the analysis of variance confirms this insofar as there are four values which show a school effect in the ranking by students. Discussion of this point will be expanded later in the section which deals directly with values.

Spearman rho calculations were completed to compare each element in the school values model with the mean rankings of the students. While this procedure is questionable due to calculations involving comparisons of mean rankings with a single ranking, it was deemed useful for analyzing the results of the application of the school model.

School Alpha components were each analyzed separately and the following Spearman rank correlation coefficients were obtained:

SES	.3728 (probability .024)
Location	.6625 (probability .001)
Social Studies	.5223 (probability .001)
Principal	.6210 (probability .001)
Teachers	.5285 (probability .002)

In School Beta the same calculations were completed with the following outcome:

SES	-.0804 (probability .340)
Location	.6174 (probability .001)
Social Studies	.1567 (probability .209)
Principal	.2231 (probability .123)
Teachers	.6060 (probability .001)

In School Gamma the calculations of the Spearman rank coefficient yielded the following:

SES	.4493 (probability .008)
Location	.6437 (probability .001)
Social Studies	.1562 (probability .210)
Principal	.4249 (probability .011)
Teachers	.6033 (probability .001)

In looking at all three of the schools, it is clear that some of the components are more congruent with student values across all three schools. The coefficients for location and teacher values were strong in all three schools. Coefficients for social studies and for SES are lowest. The contradiction in high priority values among the components gives one possible reason for difficulties in exploring school effect. The factors which may have contributed to a school effect on student values are diverse, and need to be qualitatively understood.

The socioeconomic status rankings reflected the concepts of Anyon (1981) and Carnoy and Levin (1985) which weighted values according to the social relations dictated by one's relative status in the capitalistic system. As an example, School Beta was classified as upper socioeconomic status and consequently the highest rankings were assigned to achievement, prosperous life, being influential, and being self-controlled. Among the students the values which received the highest rankings were family love, true friendship, being honest, and loving. This shows that there is serious disagreement between the values which are attributed to the school on the basis of the socioeconomic status of the community and those of the students. The calculated Spearman rho was -0.0804. This does not disprove the contentions of Carnoy and Levin, but indicates that other considerations, such as the developmental stage of students, may camouflage the effects of socioeconomic status on reported value preferences. It also draws attention to the fact that the necessary contradictions that forge value changes along SES lines may only become relevant once in the workplace, where SES is more relevant.

A visual inspection of the values rankings of principals does not show any tendency to rank values according to the SES of the school. The rank coefficients for principal values and SES-related values were 0.1185 for School Alpha, 0.3854 for School Beta, and 0.1220 for School Gamma. Apparently the principal's perception of school values is independent of the SES of the student body.

The second component in the school values model is urban location, which gave highest rankings to friendship, family love, being loving and being polite. Student values in all three

schools were related to the location rankings at about a 0.60 level of Spearman, as earlier mentioned. Although this does not necessarily support a location effect, it does indicate that the values of the location component do relate to those of the students. A full understanding of this component awaits further research where school location is varied. The Barker and Gump (1964) study suggests school size must be considered along with location.

The third factor in the school values model was the social studies ranking of values. The social studies rankings for the schools were varied due to the input from the social studies teachers about the values of the social studies texts. In two of the three schools this factor did not relate significantly to student values. It therefore seems unlikely this factor is influencing student values. These students attend social studies courses for 3.5 hours per week, which is about equal to Goodlad's (1985) figures for late elementary students. When consideration is given to the other events in a student's life that get equal or greater amounts of time, it becomes reasonable to find little or no influence on values from social studies classes. In the one school where there is a stronger relationship, it seems likely this is due to a very popular teacher who was observed by the researcher to be definite in verbalizing his values.

The finding concerning social studies as an unlikely source of influence on student values is of some interest in terms of the theories of Williams (1979). Williams stated that people changed their values in response to inconsistencies. Although students may be cognitively exposed to the differing value priorities of the social studies material, they may not be challenged personally by the material. In the normal course of classes students do not have to choose between their ideals and those of the classroom. It would not, for example, appear conflictual to place a high value on family love and protection and to be presented material with a high value on a peaceful world. They do not logically appear to contradict. Unless some situation placed these two values in direct contradiction there would be no incompatibility, and no responding change in student values. So the fact that material is in contradiction to student values is not as important as the process of presenting it, in terms of changing student values. However, a strong stance by a teacher could be expected to increase the sense of contradiction, thus increasing the probability of change in student values. Again, this highlights the importance of classroom experience as a basis for the model over simple use of the written documents.

The final factor in the school values model was the personal ranking of values by the social studies teachers. The personal values of the teachers differed but in general the same values were rated within the top four or five. A Spearman rank coefficient on teachers in the three schools yielded a rho of 0.6731 or 0.6084. The fact that the teacher values do vary some and there is a relationship between student values and teacher values is suggestive of an effect of the teachers as models.

A review of the qualitative data may help to clarify the quantitative findings. In School Alpha one social studies teacher had very strong convictions about personal dignity and a

sense of pride in ethnic background. Inspection of the cell means by grade and gender reveals that the students most likely to be influenced by this teacher placed lower values on secure country and peaceful world, higher values on religious faith, freedom of choice, equal opportunity, confidence in self, and being intelligent. The teacher in question was male; all of the value directions cited were more evident for males than for females. This teacher appears to function as a model for males and appears to exert some influence on reported values. Findings relating to this teacher draw attention to the influence of role models. This teacher is a powerful model and thus shows the impact of the teacher. Undoubtedly, the other teachers are also exerting influence, but the level of the effect may not be strong enough to be detected through quantitive measures.

The principals and teachers in all of the school agreed that the teachers' personal values are a major source of school influence on student values. One principal indicated that he regarded a teacher's ability to care for students as the most important classroom skill. Teachers in this school placed a high priority on being loving, being forgiving, and being helpful. The ethnographic information lends understanding and credibility to the reported values.

It is worthy of note that none of the teachers surveyed in this study indicated that the socioeconomic status of the students would influence values conveyed in the schools. Principals and the teachers indicated that the school configuration of a two-year (7th and 8th grade) school does not give the school much time with a student, and they therefore expect to have little or no influence on the students. It is a part of a long-term plan of the school district to restructure the schools so that students spend four years in the intermediate grades in one school. It is a part of one principal's plan to make sure that students have at least one teacher that they are with for the entire four years. This would certainly enhance the likelihood of some long-term effect from the modeling of this teacher. Classroom observations indicated that the dynamics of the classroom supported teacher reports of high values for family love, achievement, being polite, and clean. There was a great deal of variability in the teachers' behavior and in student behavior.

One result of the qualitative data-gathering activity was a strong conviction that there is a need to weight the elements of the model, on the basis of qualitative information. In School Beta, by teacher rating, the principal was not particularly a strong authority figure. The relationship between value rankings of the principal and the students was lowest (in terms of Spearman rho) of the three schools. Perhaps it would have been appropriate to weight his perceptions of school values by some factor less than 1.0. Two of the three social studies teachers were involved in extracurricular activities with the children, and were obviously well-liked by the students. The relationship between value rankings of the teachers and students (Spearman rho of .6060) indicated a high level of agreement. It appeared that the teachers as models at this school might need to have their personal value rankings weighted by a factor greater than 1.0.

Such a process of interpretive weighting would merit careful scrutiny but appears to promise a more precise description of school values. The mechanism of weighting requires a theoretical connection between the five components of the model.

The efficacy of this model for school values does not directly address the issue of actually quantifying the influence of the school on the student's values. The strongest empirical approach to actually testing school influence is to develop a workable system for generating the values of the school, survey all students before and after attendance at the school, and measure student movement toward the perceived values of the school. The system for generating the values of the school needs to have a logical base that considers factors which are open to some control by the school administration. The logical basis allows for theoretical exploration of factors, and the selection of factors that have some dynamic component allows for the alterability of the system according to the empirical findings. Of course, the reader must be open to a full understanding of each factor and its dynamic. For example, it is not possible for the school to change the socioeconomic status of a student, but it would be helpful to understand how teaching process may be reinforcing the socioeconomic status of the student (Anyon, 1981).

This study represents a first approximation to description of school values. Some components of the model appear to be related to student values. Interpretive weighting of the components is indicated as an area to explore.

Quality of School Life

This discussion explores reasons for value ranking differences for students with high QSL scores and those with low QSL scores. Gender effects are considered.

The results indicated that the students who are obtaining high scores on the QSL are conforming to each other with respect to ranking of values. Students with low scores on the QSL also conform to each other on the ranking of values, but generally at a lower level than the students with high scores. The reason for the conformity in the high and low groups can be understood when inspecting the individual values. The high QSL score students placed high priorities on family love, religious faith, and achievement. The low QSL score students placed high priorities on pleasure, prosperous life, exciting life, being brave, and being creative. These value differences may be an expression of the same sentiments that cause them to score at a particular level on the QSL. It seems to the researcher that students who value an exciting life, and being creative are not likely to experience high levels of satisfaction with school.

Another possibility with the high QSL score students is that they are closer in their values to those of the teachers and principal before they begin attending the school. This would be in accord with findings of Feather (1979) which showed that people were generally more satisfied working in an environment where the values of the workplace did not conflict with their personal values.

The relative score on the QSL was found to be a factor in the ranking of such values as family love, pleasure, religious faith, achievement, prosperous life, exciting life, forgiveness, bravery, and creativity. Several of these values are also values whose ranking is affected by gender. A frequency count of the gender of students by the relative score on the QSL shows the following:

Low QSL score students	66% male, 33% female
Middle QSL score students	50% male, 50% female
High QSL score students	40% male, 60% female

There are more females in the high QSL score student group than expected, and more males in the low QSL score student group than expected. This would certainly indicate that at least some of the relationship between QSL scores and values is due to the impact of the differential distribution of gender in the three groups, since gender has a demonstrated effect on value preferences.

Values in General

Differential value preferences of males and females, and the homogeneity of these students in value preferences are covered in this section.

When the results are examined in terms of the 29 values, it is clear that the values of early adolescents are much influenced by their gender. This finding indirectly supports the view expressed by Gilligan (1982) that there are gender differences evident in moral development. Males are more biased toward abstract concepts, while females are more relationally oriented. The data of this study support such a gender difference in so far as female students more highly ranked such values as friendship, honesty, helpfulness, being loving, and forgiving. These are values associated with relationships. On the other hand, males gave higher ranking to such values as an exciting life, being intelligent, brave, and creative. These values have much less to do with relationships than do the values highly rated by females.

One finding of this study which differs somewhat from previous studies such as McCartin and Freehill (1987) is the overwhelming homogeneity of valuing among students. The Spearman rank coefficients which contrast student means showed that students in these three schools are similar in their reported values. The only features which distinguish them are their gender and their sentiments about school, which appear to be linked. These students are all part of a pervasive culture in Hawaii. There are high percentages of Asian families, thought to have strong influence on their children and fairly uniform sets of value priorities. For whatever reason, the students in these three schools show small differences that relate to school attended.

Summary

Good and Weinstein (1986) called for a broader based research on effective schools that is extended beyond achievement. They stress the need to provide a basis for

understanding why schools vary in their effects. There is a companion need to understand why some schools produce student improvement in achievement while others do not, regardless of the level of the student at the time of entrance. This study responds to that request by preliminary exploration of the relation between school values and student values. This study tested a model for identifying the values of the school. The model generated values which were shown to relate to values of the students in three different schools. Further research is needed to test the model with different types of schools. The description of the school's values would be greatly refined by weighting the elements on the basis of ethnographic details of the school environment.

The unique geographic location of Hawaii provided an unusual ethnic mix of students attending the schools studied. The school population contained a larger number of Asian students than would be found in samples of subjects in other parts of the United States. There is no way to separate the findings in this study from possible ethnic bias introduced by the subject pool. Further research would benefit from a sample selected from a more representative population.

In addition to working on the development of a school values model, the study examined student sentiment as a possible mediator of school influence. Students with high QSL scores were more likely to be female, and placed a higher priority on family love and achievement. Students with lower QSL scores were more likely to be male, and placed a higher priority on values of pleasure, exciting life, and being brave.

The values preferences of these subjects were very much alike. Despite wide differences in socioeconomic status, value preferences were related. This suggests that the period of early adolescence itself, with concerns of gaining a personal identity, is a strong factor in reported values.

REFERENCES

Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. Journal of Education, 162, 67-92.

Barker, R., & Gump, P. (1964). Big school, small school. Stanford, CA: Stanford Press.

Bloom, A. (1987). The closing of the American mind. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Brown, N. W., & Lawson, R. (1980). Values in parochial and public schools: Alike or Different? Psychological Reports, 47, 279-282.

Carnoy, M., & Levin, H. M. (1985). Schooling and work in the democratic state. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Cole, R. A. (1972). A study of values and value systems of preadolescent school children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.

Epstein, J. L., & McPartland, J. M. (1976). The concept and measurement of the quality of school life. American Educational Research Journal, 13, 15-30.

Epstein, J. L. (1981). Patterns of classroom participation, student attitudes, and achievement. In J. Epstein (Ed.), The quality of school life (pp. 81-116). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Feather, N. T. (1979). Human values and the work situation. Australian Psychologist, 14, 131-141.

Gardiner, E. F., & Thompson, G. G. (1963). Investigation and measurement of the social values governing interpersonal relations among adolescent youth and their teachers. Cooperative Research Project No. 259A (8418) SU, Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Geertz, C. (1983). Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology. New York: Basic Books.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Good, T. L., & Weinstein, R. S. (1986). Schools make a difference. American Psychologist, 41, 1090-1097.

Goodlad, J. (1985). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kohlberg, L., Levine, C., & Hewer, A. (1984). The current formulation of the theory. In L. Kohlberg (Ed.), Essays on moral development: Volume II. The psychology of moral development: The nature and validity of moral stages (pp. 212-319). San Francisco: Harper & Row.

McCartin, R. M., & Freehill, M. (1987). Values of early adolescents compared by type of schools. Journal of Early Adolescence, 6, 369-380.

McKinney, J. P., & Moore, D. (1982). Attitudes and values during adolescence. In B. B. Wolman (Ed.), Handbook of developmental psychology (pp. 549-558). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Rokeach, M. (1979). Understanding human values. New York: Free Press.

Ryan, T. A. (1973). Value conflict in elementary schools in Hawaii. (Grant No. OEG-9-9-210528-4472). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Williams, R. (1979). Change and stability in values and values systems: A sociological perspective. In M. Rokeach (Ed.), Understanding human values (pp. 15-46). New York: Free Press.

APPENDIX A

TABLE I

RANKINGS OF THE FACTORS IN THE SCHOOL VALUES MODEL

SCHOOL ALPHA

Category	Principal	SES (Low)	Location (Urban)	Teachers	Social Studies	Mean Ranking
Terminal Values						
Family Love	7	1	2	1	6	3.4
Peaceful World	9	6	7	2	1	5.0
Freedom of Choice	3	5	11	10	3	6.4
Equal Opportunity	5	9	12	11	8	9.0
Beautiful World	10	14	13	5	7	9.8
True Friendship	6	2	1	3	5	3.4
Respect of Others	1	10	5	8	11	7.0
Secure Country	8	4	4	7	2	5.0
Pleasure	14	13	6	14	13	12.0
Confidence in Self	2	3	10	9	4	5.6
Religious Faith	11	8	14	4	10	9.4
Achievement	4	11	3	6	9	6.6
Prosperous Life	12	12	9	13	14	12.0
Exciting Life	13	7	8	12	12	10.4
Instrumental Values						
Honest	1	12	7	4	10	6.8
Helpful	5	2	5	6	8	5.2
Clean	14	4	11	13	14	11.2
Loving	2	6	1	1	5	3.0
Forgiving	4	8	8	5	9	6.8
Ambitious	10	13	12	11	12	11.6
Cheerful	13	14	13	9	13	12.4
Polite	7	3	2	2	2	3.2
Dependable	9	1	4	7	3	4.8
Capable	11	5	6	10	7	7.8
Intelligent	3	11	9	15	4	8.4
Self-Controlled	8	10	3	3	1	5.0
Brave	15	7	15	14	15	13.2
Creative	6	15	14	12	11	11.6
Influential	12	9	10	8	6	9.0

RANKINGS OF THE FACTORS IN THE SCHOOL VALUES MODEL

SCHOOL BETA

Category	Principal	SES (High)	Location (Urban)	Teachers	Social Studies	Mean Ranking
Terminal Values						
Family Love	6	8	2	2	9	5.4
Peaceful World	8	13	7	1	4	6.6
Freedom of Choice	4	5	11	8	1	5.8
Equal Opportunity	5	11	12	10	3	8.2
Beautiful World	9	14	13	7	7	10.0
True Friendship	7	10	1	3	10	6.2
Respect of Others	3	6	5	6	8	5.6
Secure Country	10	9	4	5	2	6.0
Pleasure	12	3	6	11	14	9.2
Confidence	2	4	10	9	6	6.2
Religious Faith	14	12	14	13	12	13.0
Achievement	1	1	3	4	5	2.8
Prosperous Life	13	2	9	12	13	9.8
Exciting Life	11	7	8	14	11	10.2
Instrumental Values						
Honest	9	12	7	1	9	7.6
Helpful	2	10	5	4	6	5.4
Clean	11	14	11	14	15	13.0
Loving	12	11	1	6	10	8.0
Forgiving	14	13	8	10	12	11.4
Ambitious	7	4	12	8	8	7.8
Cheerful	8	15	13	5	14	11.0
Polite	5	5	2	13	11	7.2
Dependable	6	8	4	2	4	4.8
Capable	3	6	6	9	2	5.2
Intelligent	4	3	9	12	5	6.6
Self-Controlled	10	2	3	3	3	4.2
Brave	15	9	15	15	13	13.4
Creative	13	7	14	7	7	9.6
Influential	1	1	10	11	1	4.8

RANKINGS OF THE FACTORS IN THE SCHOOL VALUES MODEL

SCHOOL GAMMA

Category	Principal	SES (Mid)	Location (Urban)	Teachers	Social Studies	Mean Ranking
Terminal Values						
Family Love	2	10	2	1	10	5.0
Peaceful World	10	7	7	4	5	6.6
Freedom of Choice	6	2	11	6	2	5.4
Equal Opportunity	1	11	12	12	7	8.6
Beautiful World	11	13	13	2	8	9.4
True Friendship	8	6	1	8	9	6.4
Respect of Others	3	12	5	9	6	7.0
Secure Country	12	3	4	3	1	4.6
Pleasure	5	9	6	13	12	9.0
Confidence	7	1	10	7	3	5.6
Religious Faith	9	4	14	5	14	9.2
Achievement	4	8	3	10	4	5.8
Prosperous Life	14	5	9	11	13	10.4
Exciting Life	13	14	8	14	11	12.0
Instrumental Values						
Honest	1	7	7	1	7	4.6
Helpful	7	8	5	3	8	6.2
Clean	14	11	11	12	14	12.4
Loving	6	6	1	2	11	5.2
Forgiving	11	10	8	4	13	9.2
Ambitious	3	13	12	13	6	9.4
Cheerful	4	12	13	5	15	9.8
Polite	8	5	2	11	12	7.6
Dependable	9	1	4	8	5	5.4
Capable	10	4	6	6	1	5.4
Intelligent	5	2	9	9	2	5.4
Self-Controlled	2	3	3	7	4	3.8
Brave	12	15	15	15	9	13.2
Creative	15	14	14	10	10	12.6
Influential	13	9	10	14	3	9.8

APPENDIX A

TABLE II

SOCIAL STUDIES FACTOR RANKINGS

SCHOOL ALPHA

Category	Curriculum	Teacher Rank of Text	Mean Ranking	Social Studies Rankings
Terminal Values				
Family Love	10	3.0	6.50	6
Peaceful World	5	2.0	3.50	1
Freedom of Choice	2	7.0	4.50	3
Equal Opportunity	4	9.5	6.75	8
Beautiful World	7	6.5	6.75	7
True Friendship	8	4.5	6.25	5
Respect of Others	9	9.0	9.00	11
Secure Country	3	5.0	4.00	2
Pleasure	12	12.5	12.25	13
Confidence	1	8.0	4.50	4
Religious Faith	13	4.0	8.50	10
Achievement	6	9.0	7.50	9
Prosperous Life	14	12.5	13.25	14
Exciting Life	11	12.5	11.75	12
Instrumental Values				
Honest	13	4.0	8.50	10
Helpful	10	6.0	8.00	8
Clean	12	13.0	12.50	14
Loving	8	3.0	5.50	5
Forgiving	11	5.5	8.25	9
Ambitious	9	12.0	11.50	12
Cheerful	14	10.0	12.00	13
Polite	6	4.0	5.00	2
Dependable	5	5.5	5.25	3
Capable	1	11.5	6.25	7
Intelligent	2	8.5	5.25	4
Self-Controlled	3	4.0	3.50	1
Brave	15	13.0	14.00	15
Creative	7	12.0	9.50	11
Influential	4	8.0	6.00	6

SOCIAL STUDIES FACTOR RANKINGS

SCHOOL BETA

Category	Curriculum	Teacher Rank of Text	Mean Ranking	Social Studies Rankings
Terminal Values				
Family Love	10	5.67	7.83	9
Peaceful World	5	6.00	5.50	4
Freedom of Choice	2	1.67	1.83	1
Equal Opportunity	4	5.00	4.50	3
Beautiful World	7	7.00	7.00	7
True Friendship	8	11.00	9.50	10
Respect of Others	9	5.33	7.165	8
Secure Country	3	3.00	3.00	2
Pleasure	12	13.00	12.50	14
Confidence	1	12.00	6.50	6
Religious Faith	13	8.30	10.65	12
Achievement	6	6.67	6.33	5
Prosperous Life	14	11.00	12.50	13
Exciting Life	11	9.33	10.167	11
Instrumental Values				
Honest	13	4.67	8.84	9
Helpful	10	5.67	7.84	6
Clean	12	15.00	13.50	15
Loving	8	9.67	8.84	10
Forgiving	11	9.67	10.33	12
Ambitious	9	7.33	8.17	8
Cheerful	14	10.33	12.17	14
Polite	6	12.00	9.00	11
Dependable	5	5.00	5.00	4
Capable	1	6.67	3.84	2
Intelligent	2	8.00	5.00	5
Self-Controlled	3	6.67	4.84	3
Brave	15	7.00	11.00	13
Creative	7	8.67	7.84	7
Influential	4	3.67	3.84	1

SOCIAL STUDIES FACTOR RANKINGS

SCHOOL GAMMA

Category	Curriculum	Teacher Rank of Text	Mean Ranking	Social Studies Rankings
Terminal Values				
Family Love	10	8.33	9.17	10
Peaceful World	5	4.67	4.84	5
Freedom of Choice	2	2.33	2.17	2
Equal Opportunity	4	9.67	6.84	7
Beautiful World	7	10.00	8.50	8
True Friendship	8	9.67	8.84	9
Respect of Others	9	4.67	6.84	6
Secure Country	3	1.00	2.00	1
Pleasure	12	10.67	11.34	12
Confidence	1	6.33	3.67	3
Religious Faith	13	13.00	13.00	14
Achievement	6	3.33	4.67	4
Prosperous	14	12.00	13.00	13
Exciting Life	11	9.33	10.17	11
Instrumental Values				
Honest	13	3.67	8.34	7
Helpful	10	6.67	8.34	8
Clean	12	15.00	13.50	14
Loving	8	10.33	9.17	11
Forgiving	11	12.33	11.67	13
Ambitious	9	5.33	7.17	6
Cheerful	14	14.00	14.00	15
Polite	6	12.67	9.34	12
Dependable	5	5.67	5.33	5
Capable	1	4.67	2.84	1
Intelligent	2	5.67	3.84	2
Self-Controlled	3	7.33	5.17	4
Brave	15	2.00	8.50	9
Creative	7	10.33	8.67	10
Influential	4	4.33	4.17	3

APPENDIX B

TABLE III

LIST OF VALUES IN COLE SURVEY

Terminal Values

Family Love
Peaceful World
Freedom of Choice
Equal Opportunity
Beautiful World
True Friendship
Respect of Others
Secure Country
Pleasure
Confidence
Religious Faith
Achievement
Prosperous Life
Exciting Life

Instrumental Values

Honest
Helpful
Clean
Loving
Forgiving
Ambitious
Cheerful
Polite
Dependable
Capable
Intelligent
Self-Controlled
Brave
Creative
Influential

APPENDIX C

MEAN RANKING OF STUDENTS BY SCHOOL

Category	School Alpha	School Beta	School Gamma	ANOVA Effect
Terminal Values				
Family Love	2.86	3.59	3.08	
Peaceful World	6.28	5.85	5.57	
Freedom of Choice	7.45	5.89	6.49	*
Equal Opportunity	8.83	8.35	8.51	
Beautiful World	9.01	7.83	8.09	
True Friendship	5.36	5.39	5.69	
Respect for Others	7.40	7.16	8.14	*
Secure Country	7.91	8.30	7.42	
Pleasure	7.78	7.76	7.25	
Confidence	5.53	6.45	7.46	*
Religious Faith	10.28	10.36	10.83	
Achievement	9.04	9.17	9.39	
Prosperous Life	8.19	8.81	7.86	
Exciting Life	9.06	9.98	9.22	
Instrumental Values				
Honest	5.12	5.08	5.36	
Helpful	6.43	7.04	6.71	
Clean	9.74	9.68	9.97	
Loving	4.85	5.26	5.19	
Forgiving	7.57	7.04	7.54	
Ambitious	7.96	7.60	8.55	
Cheerful	9.13	9.55	9.17	
Polite	7.01	6.79	6.80	
Dependable	8.21	6.83	7.56	*
Capable	8.72	8.74	8.45	
Intelligent	6.61	7.64	6.90	
Self-Controlled	6.41	6.71	6.81	
Brave	10.14	10.61	9.77	
Creative	11.01	10.76	9.73	
Influential	11.19	10.67	11.51	

MEAN RANKING OF STUDENTS BY GRADE

Category	Grade 7	Grade 8	ANOVA Effect
Terminal Values			
Family Love	2.83	3.53	•
Peaceful World	5.49	6.25	
Freedom of Choice	6.56	6.61	
Equal Opportunity	8.60	8.50	
Beautiful World	8.28	8.28	
True Friendship	5.50	5.50	
Respect of Others	7.57	7.68	
Secure Country	7.58	8.10	
Pleasure	7.91	7.20	
Confidence	6.40	6.76	
Religious Faith	10.34	10.71	
Achievement	9.29	9.14	
Prosperous Life	8.52	7.97	
Exciting Life	10.07	8.72	•
Instrumental Values			
Honest	5.08	5.33	
Helpful	6.58	6.88	
Clean	10.35	9.25	•
Loving	4.77	5.46	
Forgiving	7.34	7.45	
Ambitious	8.21	7.95	
Cheerful	9.62	8.92	
Polite	6.69	7.03	
Dependable	7.35	7.71	
Capable	8.83	8.40	
Intelligent	7.04	7.04	
Self-Controlled	6.17	7.18	•
Brave	10.57	9.69	
Creative	10.44	10.41	
Influential	10.97	11.35	

MEAN RANKING OF STUDENTS BY GENDER

Category	Male	Female	ANOVA Effect
Terminal Values			
Family Love	3.43	2.92	
Peaceful World	5.85	5.89	
Freedon of Choice	6.49	6.68	
Equal Opportunity	8.61	8.49	
Beautiful World	8.27	8.29	
True Friendship	5.93	5.07	*
Respect of Others	7.66	7.58	
Secure Country	7.83	7.85	
Pleasure	7.24	7.88	
Confidence	6.98	6.18	
Religious Faith	10.51	10.53	
Achievement	9.48	8.96	
Prosperous Life	7.91	8.59	
Exciting Life	8.76	10.05	*
Instrumental Values			
Honest	5.88	4.54	*
Helpful	7.06	6.40	●
Clean	9.90	9.72	
Loving	5.56	4.66	●
Forgiving	8.02	6.77	*
Ambitious	7.91	8.25	
Cheerful	9.57	8.98	
Polite	7.44	6.28	*
Dependable	7.35	7.70	
Capable	8.41	8.82	
Intelligent	6.44	7.64	*
Self-Controlled	6.91	6.41	
Brave	9.16	11.11	*
Creative	9.81	11.03	*
Influential	10.97	11.35	*

MEAN RANKING OF STUDENTS BY QSL SCORE

Category	HI QSL (> 18)	Mid QSL (10-18)	Low QSL (< 10)	ANOVA Effect
Terminal Values				
Family Love	2.65	2.85	4.67	*
Peaceful World	5.92	5.85	6.18	
Freedom of Choice	7.05	6.47	6.92	
Equal Opportunity	8.64	8.49	9.03	
Beautiful Worle	8.65	8.01	8.73	
True Friendship	5.55	5.49	5.92	
Respect of Others	7.67	7.84	8.03	
Secure Country	8.00	7.13	8.53	
Pleasure	8.31	7.54	5.67	*
Confidence in Self	5.90	6.98	6.77	
Religious Faith	9.88	10.67	11.63	•
Achievement	8.49	9.94	8.75	*
Prosperous Life	8.71	8.08	6.87	•
Exciting Life	9.57	9.50	7.47	*
Instrumental Values				
Honest	4.87	5.16	6.63	
Helpful	6.64	6.50	7.58	
Clean	9.85	9.62	9.15	
Loving	4.89	4.98	5.48	
Forgiving	7.21	6.91	8.97	*
Ambitious	8.36	7.83	8.38	
Cheerful	8.93	9.31	9.60	
Polite	7.05	6.61	8.08	
Dependable	8.09	7.55	8.07	
Capable	8.60	8.49	8.17	
Intelligent	6.62	7.24	5.93	
Self-Controlled	6.07	7.40	7.20	
Brave	10.70	10.29	7.60	*
Creative	10.69	10.55	8.82	•
Influential	11.54	11.58	10.30	

APPENDIX D

INTERACTION EFFECTS - MEAN RANKINGS

SCHOOL BY GRADE

Category	School 1		School 2		School 3		ANOVA
	Gr 7	Gr 8	Gr 7	Gr 8	Gr 7	Gr 8	Effect
Terminal Values							
Secure Country	8.19	7.68	7.82	8.81	7.03	7.89	**
Religious Faith	8.92	11.45	10.59	10.11	11.05	10.56	**
Prosperous Life	9.54	7.04	9.21	8.38	7.36	8.45	**
Instrumental Values							
Honest	5.63	4.58	4.18	6.04	5.41	5.31	**

GRADE BY GENDER

Category	MALE		FEMALE		ANOVA
	Gr 7	Gr 8	Gr 7	Gr 8	Effect
Terminal Values					
True Friendship	5.59	6.27	5.41	4.69	**
Instrumental Values					
Loving	4.67	6.45	4.86	4.44	**
Capable	9.19	7.64	8.49	9.19	**

SCHOOL BY GENDER

Category	School 1		School 2		School 3		ANOVA
	Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Effect
Instrumental Values							
Ambitious	7.18	8.65	7.95	7.21	8.40	8.70	**

* Significant at the 0.01 level
**Significant at the 0.05 level

APPENDIX D

INTERACTION EFFECTS - MEAN RANKINGS

QSL BY GENDER

Category	High		Middle		Low		ANOVA Effect
	Male	Fem	Male	Fem	Male	Fem	
Terminal Values							
True Friendship	6.62	4.78	5.45	5.52	6.72	4.30	*
Instrumental Values							
Self-Controlled	6.14	6.02	7.07	7.74	8.25	5.10	**
Brave	9.33	11.69	10.13	10.46	6.23	10.35	**
Creative	10.76	10.64	9.53	11.59	8.78	8.90	**
Influential	10.36	12.40	11.31	11.85	9.45	12.00	**

QSL BY SCHOOL

Category	School 1			School 2			School 3			ANOVA Effect
	Hi	Mid	Lo	Hi	Mid	Lo	Hi	Mid	Lo	
Terminal Values										
Respect of Others	7.17	7.70	7.88	8.83	8.35	6.00	8.18	7.77	8.81	**
Instrumental Values										
Influential	11.65	11.93	8.47	12.00	10.06	10.55	11.33	11.82	11.19	**

* Significant at 0.01 level
**Significant at 0.05 level